

RADIO TV REPORTS, INC.

3333 CONNECTICUT AVE., N.W., WASHINGTON, D. C. 20008, WOODLEY 6-6300

FOR PUBLIC AFFAIRS STAFF

PROGRAM Meet the Press

STATION WRC-TV
NBC Network

DATE February 26, 1967 3:00 PM CITY Washington, DC

FULL TEXT

EDWIN NEWMAN: "This is Edwin Newman inviting you to a special edition of 'Meet the Press' on the CIA controversy."

* * *

NEWMAN: "Recent disclosures of CIA subsidies to the National Student Association and other organizations have again focused attention on the CIA. Serious questions are being raised about the CIA's undercover activities, and about the need for greater control over the Agency.

"Our guests in this special edition -- one hour -- of 'Meet the Press' represent a variety of views on the matter.

"Senator Joseph S. Clark, Democrat of Pennsylvania, a member of the Foreign Relations Committee.

"Senator Henry M. Jackson, Democrat of Washington, a member of the CIA Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee.

"Robert Amory, Jr., former Deputy Director for Intelligence of the CIA.

"Sam Brown, Chairman of the National Supervisory Board of the National Students Association, and

"Dennis Shaul, former President of the National Students Association.

"On our panel of reporters today are Lawrence E. Spivak, permanent member of the 'Meet the Press' panel.

"Max Frankel of the New York Times.

"Thomas B. Ross of the Chicago Sun Times, and

"Douglas Kiker of NBC News.

"We'll have the first questions now from Mr. Spivak."

SPIVAK: "Mr. Brown, I'd like to start with you. I know you think that the secret arrangements that were made between the CIA and some of the leaders of your organization, the National Student Association, were wrong. Will you tell our audience, briefly, just why you think the arrangements were wrong?"

BROWN: "Not to get involved in too philosophical a discussion, but several hundred years ago, Mr. de Tocqueville, in observing American society commented that the strength of that society lay in its voluntary organizations, and that the strength of any free society was centered in those organizations, and it seems to me that recent discoveries concerning the involvement of the CIA have, in fact, compromised a number of those free, voluntary associations, and in that way, says something very fundamental about the nature of our society, and says some very important things about the nature of those voluntary associations. I think the things which it says are not very complimentary, and I would like to think that I live in a country in which those voluntary organizations are indeed free."

SPIVAK: "Mr. Shaul, I know that you approved of the arrangement made by the CIA, and I believe as President during the years that you were President you cooperated with the CIA. Will you tell our audience why you approved and why you cooperated -- just what was right in your judgment?"

SHAUL: "Mr. Spivak, I don't agree that the character of the voluntary organizations was in any way compromised, and I think in addition, to that there were three important points that justified the arrangement.

"The first was that without this finance we would have had no international programming.

"The second is -- following directly from that -- that without that international programming, a number of progressive organizations now existing in the developing areas simply would not have existed. And our confrontation with forces alien to the ideology and policies of the United States would have been greatly weakened.

"And third, following from those two, it seems to me that we

have across this country today a number of students who have had an opportunity to engage in the thrust and parry of international politics precisely because of this subsidy."

SPIVAK: "Senator Clark, our government's purpose was to influence international student and other organizations who are -- through these organizations, just as the communists were doing, and the communists were spending, according to a report, hundreds of millions of dollars to do their job. Now, do you think the purpose was bad, or just the means that we used were bad?"

CLARK: "I think the purpose was bad, the means were good. I don't see why we couldn't have done the same thing through the Fulbright Scholarship."

SPIVAK: "You mean the means were bad. You think the purpose was good."

CLARK: "The purpose was good."

SPIVAK: "And you think they could have been done through the Fulbright Scholarships?"

CLARK: "We'd have had a little trouble with Congressman Rooney, but I think that could have been handled."

SPIVAK: "Wouldn't they have to have done this in secret too?"

CLARK: "I don't think so. I think it'd be much better to have it right on top of the table. I'm one who believes that in a democracy, as Mr. Brown has said, the less secrecy the better. I'm sure we can't abolish it all; I think we could have abolished the secrecy in this case."

SPIVAK: "Senator Jackson, there are many observers who believe one of the most serious things that's happened in this whole CIA expose -- as a result of the expose is that our business leaders abroad, our students abroad, our scientists abroad, our educators, are all going to be suspect now, just as these students are now suspect because of the CIA involvement. Do you think that suspicion is going to be cast on almost everybody from this point on?"

JACKSON: "I think the situation is that they have been suspect for a long time, and I'm sure that a lot of our European friends must be getting sort of a laugh out of what's going on over here."

4

I would guess that they assumed that this was going on. They're far more sophisticated, I think, than some of the critics. I think it's a matter that we have to assume as a world power that we're going to be suspect when our people go abroad."

SPIVAK: "Would you say that the people who come here from behind the Iron Curtain -- their businessmen, their students, their scientists -- are just as suspect even though they don't come from their CIA?"

JACKSON: "Well, we have assumed for a long time that they are not always sending their pure students, true businessmen, and so on. To assume otherwise, since the Cold War, I think would be the height of naivete."

SPIVAK: "Mr. Amory, there're many observers who feel that the usefulness of the CIA really has been very badly and dangerously impaired. Do you think so as a result of all this?"

AMORY: "No, I don't. I think this is in a sense a tempest in a teapot. We had the same kinds of charges levelled against us in 1960 when the U-2 was shot down -- that we had destroyed mankind's last free chance of peace in the summit conference, but after all was said and done, most Americans and most of the people in the Free World thought we'd done a damn good job to keep on top of the Soviet situation.

"I think here -- I agree with Mr. Shaul that it's too bad this had to blow. I agree in part with Senator Clark that it would have been nice if we could have done this through another mechanism, but I don't think this is a totally disastrous incident at all."

NEWMAN: "Thank you, gentlemen. We'll be back with this special edition of 'Meet the Press' on the CIA controversy, but first this message."

* * *

NEWMAN: "Resuming of our special edition of 'Meet the Press' examining the current CIA controversy.

"We'll continue the questions with Mr. Frankel."

FRANKEL: "Senator Jackson, I'd like to deal with the internal fallout of some of these activities by our government. What right

5

does the citizen have in this situation who wants to join an organization, get a grant from a foundation, but does not deliberately want to get involved with his government? What do we do about protecting him?"

JACKSON: "Well, I think the individual is clearly protected. He, of course, can't be privy to everything in the government. It's always been that way, but certainly the individual is protected as far as obtaining whatever information he may need."

FRANKEL: "No, but if a citizen wants to join a given organization, or wants to go to a given foundation and get a grant for scholarship abroad, but wants to keep clear of his own government. These organizations advertise themselves as private, and our government, when it finances them in this way, insists that they continue to advertise themselves as private. Now, how can he protect himself?"

JACKSON: "Yes, but as I understand it, the cases that you pose are not involved in any of these situations. In other words, the aid abroad was used primarily to assist foreign students and to assist in connection with international activities abroad."

FRANKEL: "But it was involved with every student who joined the National Student Association."

JACKSON: "The CIA was not financing scholarships abroad."

FRANKEL: "Well, let me move to another subject, another domestic issue here. What rights does a taxpayer have to protect himself against the use of his money in support of private organizations in the United States? In other words, if the government, through the CIA, decides to support this or that organization which is also active in domestic political issues, doesn't the taxpayer, let's say if he disagrees with most of the things NSA does, doesn't he have a right to...."

JACKSON: "I don't imagine that the average donor to a foundation can find out everything that's going on about the internal operations unless he is an officer of that organization. I do not know that he has a right as a simple donor to find out everything about it. If he is an officer of it he certainly does have that right."

FRANKEL: "But here is the NSA...."

JACKSON: "That would depend on the laws under which the foundation was set up."

FRANKEL: "But here was this student organization living in a building which was owned by the government -- the lease on it was held by a CIA front organization -- sounding off about Vietnam and all kinds of other issues. There are other people whose tax money is involved in that building. Don't they have a right to be protected against this kind of...."

JACKSON: "Well, the duly constituted officers had a right apparently to obtain the money from the CIA, so, therefore, they were acting completely within their legal rights."

NEWMAN: "Mr. Ross."

ROSS: "Mr. Amory, in addition to the CIA's involvement in this country, it is quite clear that the Agency has been involved in various enterprises overseas, such as attempts and sometimes successful attempts, to overthrow foreign governments. By what right and with what justification has the Agency involved themselves in these various operations?"

AMORY: "Well, I'd like to start, Mr. Ross, by saying the Agency doesn't do these things on its own motion. The Agency, as pointed out by Senator Symington after he had listened to Director Helms last week, is an operational agency that does what it's told by the Constitutional authorities of the United States. It may be the President himself in a specific, important issue, and if you're talking about major things like Guatemala, which is now part of history, that was a Presidential decision taken with the full knowledge of the senior members of the Senate and House, and the CIA was nothing but the instrument of the United States government, a professional organization, doing the work of our constituted authorities."

ROSS: "Well, how do you square your response with the fact, say, as in a specific incident with the NSA, the President of the United States instructed one of his assistants to declare that he was totally unaware of this operation? Where does this put us?"

AMORY: "Well, the answer to this is -- you said there're various activities. CIA is a busy, major league operation doing a lot of things. I don't expect the President of the United States, who I know works about 22 hours a day, to be on top of everything, particularly something as small as this, but he has on his staff --

7

now Walt Rostow, before him Mac Bundy, before that under Eisenhower, General Cutler -- who are intimately advised, and if they have any worries that the President might be worried, they have access to him any minute. And in addition to that, his Under Secretary of State, his Deputy Secretary of Defense, are intimately and personally aware of what's going on."

ROSS: "Well, don't you feel that in view -- just on the level of the number of CIA operations which have been blown, that the mechanism for control of the Agency, and for assuring its success, are somewhat inadequate?"

AMORY: "No, I don't. I think if you take the total history of 15 years, you say the number of things that have been blown -- some of them have been blown because they're ancient history and people now feel free to talk about them. The ones that have been blown while in currency are a very, very small number compared to the total."

NEWMAN: "May I ask you for a definition of blown. Do you mean...."

AMORY: "Becoming public knowledge whether or not in a scandalous sense, but coming to the surface. And there're many things that come nominally to the surface -- maybe Mr. Frankel's paper asserts something -- doesn't necessarily mean it's totally blown. That's their opinion."

NEWMAN: "Mr. Kiker."

KIKER: "Mr. Brown, you say now you deplore the arrangement that existed between your organization and the CIA, but if Ramparts magazine hadn't disclosed the fact that the CIA was subsidizing you, wouldn't this still be the case?"

BROWN: "No, it would not be the case. This was made very clear over the period of the last year and a half. The Association has worked consistently to free itself of these ties and has succeeded to the extent that a year ago we had almost \$300,000 from the Agency.

"This year, up to this point, we have had approximately \$15,000 and have sent back any remaining funds."

KIKER: "What about the future of your organization? You're getting a lot of criticism especially from college campuses where you have three hundred chapters. Will you survive this, do you think?"

BROWN: "In fact, the criticism has been very minor compared to the support for the position taken in the last week. The criticism primarily came at the time of the first revelations of the connection."

KIKER: "Where will you get your money now? The money which we have now -- a budget of approximately eight hundred thousand dollars -- is completely free of any CIA money."

KIKER: "Let me ask you...."

BROWN: "And we feel that we can maintain that budget of eight hundred thousand dollars and continue the organization very clearly."

KIKER: "Let me ask you this. Your President, Eugene Groves, said earlier this week that after starting out just to subsidize your organization, that in the last '50's and early '60's the CIA began to pay overseas NSC representatives to buddy up the foreign students and then report back to the CIA on what they had learned. How widespread was this and how many people knew about it?"

BROWN: "It's difficult to say how widespread it is. We know -- I know of only a few instances in which that occurred. I do know that it has occurred. The extent of that is not known."

KIKER: "Well, did you try in any way to dissuade the Agency from taking this extra step forward? Did they ask you, demand that you do it, or what?"

BROWN: "Well, unfortunately, I was not given the protection which has been insisted the individual should have, that is, I wrote some reports which were submitted to the Association which I now have been led to understand were later submitted to the Agency, without having any concept that those reports were going on to the Agency. I certainly would not have been involved had I known that those reports might in turn be submitted to the Agency, and I was simply not protected and in many cases people participated in a relationship like that without knowing what they were doing or who they were doing it for.

9

In the case of the officers of the Association, in the past that decision apparently was a conscious decision to participate and to act with the Agency, and in those cases I presume that they decided that was either in the best interest of the Association or of the country or of both. I might disagree with that."

NEWMAN: "Mr. Spivak."

SPIVAK: "Mr. Shaul, a minute ago in answer to my question, you made out a case for what you did and for what the Students Association did. Do you think there was anything at all wrong in what you did?"

SHAUL: "I think that there were -- was a very real moral choice presented to us -- an ethical problem, if you will, in that I think anytime one accepts money secretly from the government, one runs the risk of accepting some controls, and had not the controls been manageable from our point of view, I would not have accepted the relationship."

SPIVAK: "Now the National Supervisory Board of the NSA said the other day that some members and staff officers of the organization had been trapped into collecting sensitive information for the CIA. Were you trapped?"

SHAUL: "I want to make quite clear the fact that I just disagreed with this statement. Now, I realize that Mr. Brown was speaking of the years in which he himself had some knowledge, and I'm speaking for the years in which I had some knowledge, but at no time was anyone confronted with a choice where he had to swear an oath and then find out that he was bound up in a secret arrangement. What in fact did happen was that one was given always the opportunity to continue or terminate the relationship."

SPIVAK: "As far as you know, did you collect any sensitive information?"

SHAUL: "No."

SPIVAK: "Were you asked for any information of that nature?"

SHAUL: "No."

SPIVAK: "Do you consider that at anytime you were engaged in what is known as spying?"

10

SHAUL: "No, I don't. I can say that the reasons that I don't think we ever were were these:

"First, I had a fairly intimate knowledge of what was going on in my staff and organization at the time.

"Secondly, most of the reports and data, most of the individuals who were abroad were forced to report in public and circulate their reports to the campuses, so those reports were, for the most part, public.

"And third, it just doesn't strike me as very likely that the kind of individuals that we were dealing with were of great interest to the CIA or that the kind of people that we had abroad were the kind of people who would have been very successful at spying."

SPIVAK: "Now, there's a widespread belief that your Association -- the Students Association has been very badly damaged. What's your judgment on that? Do you think you have been badly damaged?"

SHAUL: "Well, I think one has to point out that the damage may very well be primarily in the international area. I think that the Association can continue, but it seems to me that it is opting for being primarily a domestic organization, and I want to say that I just reject the notion that we don't need an international student organization, and I'm afraid that NSA has very much weakened its ability to be such."

SPIVAK: "You have something you wanted to say, Mr. Brown?"

BROWN: "Yes, with regard to the sensitivity of information, I think that's a difficult question because what's defined as sensitive probably differs between people, but certainly in the period of '62, '63 there are reports available at the National Student Association -- confidential reports submitted concerning personalities of foreign student associations. Now, whether those were passed to the Agency as they were in later years, I can't comment."

NEWMAN: "What was the purpose of making such reports to the Student Association?"

BROWN: "The reason that I participated, for instance, in making such a report, having no idea where they would go, was simply because, as with other people, it's important that you know who

11

you're acting with and who you're reacting with. Personalities of foreign student associations were important to us in terms of how do you deal with them, who holds power in the union, and how do you react to that person when he makes a statement."

NEUMAN: "Mr. Frankel."

FRANKEL: "Senator Clark, you said you would have preferred to do this by means of Fulbright Scholarships. What do you think was in fact the reason why our government chose to do it secretly?"

CLARK: "I think it was the easy way out. I'm speculating. I don't know. There is resistance in the Congress, notably in the House, to a lesser extent in the Senate, to the kind of international relationships with, communist youth movements which are people who are perhaps a little to the left of center, who are engaging in it. And I think the agency, and possibly the State Department, and maybe others -- Mr. Amory would know better than I -- felt that it would be pretty tough to get the amount of money through that was needed to conduct these activities at the rate of interest that they desired, and therefore the easy way out was to let the CIA do it."

FRANKEL: "But our government is full of organizations and people who believe very passionately that the national interest deserves this or that program, and Congress can at times be very stubborn about it in not approving those programs. Is there any justification for then saying, well let's do it the secret way?"

CLARK: "I don't think so."

NEUMAN: "Senator Jackson, do you want to comment on something? Senator Clark --"

JACKSON: "...get this problem in proper context, that when this situation first arose in 1951-52, the Department of State was the last agency that could be of any help. Lest we forget, Senator Joseph McCarthy was running loose, the State Department was discredited in this area, and to get the funds to the groups that would really need it, it would be alleged, as it was alleged at the time, that Communists were getting it, left wing groups are getting it, so that it was the task of the CIA in the first instance because the State Department couldn't have it.

12

"Secondly, I don't see how you'd use Fulbright money to assist international entities abroad.

"Now it's one thing to talk about scholarships, but that's not the whole problem. That's only a minor part of this problem of setting up student groups -- many of them on the democratic left -- that could be helpful to the democratic cause in these countries, and the Fulbright program does not cover that area to my knowledge."

CLARK: "I think what Senator Jackson said was true then -- in the fifties at the height of the McCarthy scare. I don't think it's true today, and I think we ought to fight it out on the honorable and on-top-of-the-table basis now."

NEUMAN: "Mr. Amory, did you want to say something?"

AMORY: "Well, I just commenting on the same line that Senator Jackson mentioned. Actually, the very first set up of this program -- action program, was in the State Department. The first head of it was the Deputy Assistant Secretary of State, and it was decided by the highest levels of the Congressional leadership and the White House that all this country could afford was one privy purse -- to use an expression that's been in the free world since Queen Elizabeth's time -- and we better put it all together where the type committees of the Congress, such as Senator Jackson sits on, could monitor the whole thing rather than scatter it around in a lot of cubbyholes where you'd have trouble."

NEUMAN: "Mr. Ross."

ROSS: "Senator Jackson, you were a member of Congress in 1947 when the National Security Act was passed establishing the CIA. Were you aware at that time that the CIA was being authorized to conduct extensive operations, both at home and abroad?"

JACKSON: "Well, I would have been disappointed if they were not to undertake that. I'd been abroad enough to know that there was a lot of things that we need to do abroad at that time, and it was a period of great ferment. It was a period, and still is a period, in which there was a great threat to the free labor movement and to the youth groups, and that problem is even greater

today than it was twenty years ago."

ROSS: "Do you feel in that respect that this authorization had in fact been laid out in the National Security Act, or rather has it evolved by Executive Order since that time?"

JACKSON: "Well, the National Security Act is broad enough to cover everything that has been alleged that the CIA has done, and then some. Obviously you don't provide a bill of particulars as to every detail in the statute that the CIA should undertake to do but the charter -- the Act of '47, the subsequent Act, I believe, of '49 -- more than gives the authority that they need, so there's no violation of any statutory authority whatever."

ROSS: "How do you square what you say with the fact that President Truman two or three years ago stated that when he asked for this legislation and that when he set up the CIA, he had no intention that it become an operational organization, but rather that it limit itself exclusively to intelligence gathering?"

JACKSON: "Well, I'm surprised to hear that statement. I have not read Mr. Truman's statement, but bear in mind that President Truman, as I recollect the history of this, after the transition from OSS, there was an interim period in which the then President, President Harry Truman by Executive Order set up a coordinating agency that I think was headed by Admiral Leahy and Secretary Forrestal and Secretary Robert Patterson -- there were three of them -- and they coordinated it and they were then involved in the collection and operation of intelligence activities, and that was done purely by the President himself, not by statute. And the statute, of course, is very clear on this. I don't think there's any question, and I'm sure there must be a misunderstanding on President Truman's part, because while he was President, all of these things you've referred to, certainly was the responsibility of the CIA."

NEUMAN: "Mr. Kiker."

KIKER: "Mr. Amory, the fact that the CIA has been subsidizing the NSA has led to the disclosure that, in fact, the CIA also is subsidizing dozens of other activities through foundations. Today Carl Rowan, who is formerly the head of the US Information Agency,

14

and a former State Department official, said that these exposures could go on and on, that, in fact, that there are dozens of other organizations and groups which have cooperated and are cooperating with the CIA -- private organizations. Let me ask you first, is this true?"

AMORY: "That these investigations could go on and on...."

KIKER: "That there are dozens more."

AMORY: "It seems to me this is like the famous old figure of speech. It's a strand in the sweater; its unraveling. If it unravels the whole thing like Ulysses' wife's garment, it'll be nothing but a pile of yarn on the floor and this will be a disaster, and I feel that the gentlemen of the fourth estate, many of whom are in this room, who are pursuing this all the way might just as well be in the business of scuttling carriers in the Tonkin Gulf. They're destroying an important part of the National Security fabric."

KIKER: "Mr. Richard Helms, Director of the CIA, has said that the CIA now will get out of this business, by and large. If that is the case, in fact, how long in your opinion as a former agency official will it take for them to phase themselves out, if they started today?"

AMORY: "Oh, I can assure you that we can phase out in 24 hours in many things, and one of the misapprehensions around -- Scotty Reston had a column a few days ago saying that we never know how to turn one of these things off. The fact is that these things are reviewed and reviewed and reviewed again, and when they're found to be anachronistic or no longer timely or as good as they should be, they are scrubbed."

NEUMAN: "Gentlemen, I must interrupt briefly at this point. We'll be back with Meet the Press and more questions for our guests after station identification."

* * *

NEUMAN: "Now, resuming our one hour special edition of Meet the Press on the CIA controversy, our guests today are Senator Joseph S. Clark of the Foreign Relations Committee, Senator Henry M. Jackson of the CIA Sub-committee of the Armed Services Committee, Robert Amory Jr., former Deputy Director for Intelligence of the

15

CIA, Sam Brown Chairman of the Supervisory Board of the National Students Association, and Dennis Shaul former President of the National Students Association.

"On our panel of reporters are Lawrence E. Spivak, permanent member of the Meet the Press panel; Max Frankel of the New York Times; Thomas B. Ross of the Chicago Sun Times; Douglas Kiker of NBC News.

"We'll continue the questions with Mr. Spivak."

SPIVAK: "Mr. Brown, your organization took millions of dollars from the CIA indirectly. Did the organization contribute anything of value for that money?"

BROWN: "I suppose that's a judgment that could be better made by Mr. Amory than by myself. As to the value of it, I know about somethings which were contributed. Primarily, they concerned personality sketches of foreign student leaders and the strengths and weaknesses of various student groups, probably not information which couldn't be obtained at least as well if not better through other sources. If they were relying on NSA for information, I think they were relying on a very weak link in terms of intelligence information. Primarily I think what was provided by the Association was I suppose what you could call a voice of the free world in the student world, or something to that effect. We were, in fact, presenting what apparently the agency considered to be a moderate, responsible view of American students abroad and an opportunity to have contact, and I think it was that generalized."

SPIVAK: "Would you have done this job without the CIA money, or could you have done this job without the CIA money?"

BROWN: "Well, it's two different questions. We probably would have if we could have, and I'm not sure that we could have, which I think is a very important comment because what it seems to me to say, and it's very disturbing -- some of the other things which have been said -- it seems to me that what your saying when you say only the agency could do it and the State Department couldn't do it is very much an elitist view of government which says that we in the agency and we -- a few leadership in the Congressional branch know better than the rest -- the remainder of the Congressional branch or the people at large, and as a consequence we made a decision

16

without ever having the obligation, really, to do that, or the right to do that in a democratic system because other people didn't know enough to do it, and it seems to me that's a very --

SPIVAK: "And you blame the agency, and I take it you blame the government, but isn't it true that it was your organizations that went to the State Department for the money in the first place?"

BROWN: "There's quite a difference between going to the State Department and going to the agency, and there's quite a controversy going internally about who went to who first."

SPIVAK: "Suppose the State Department had given you the money and had -- and kept it secret; would that have been all right in your judgement? Would that have been moral?"

BROWN: "No."

SPIVAK: "Do you think they could have given you the money and had you do an effective job without some secrecy?"

BROWN: "Precisely what I'm saying is that it would probably would have been impossible, and in fact the international program of the Association during those years would have been severely jeopardized, but it seems to me that is one of the concerns of a free society, that it respond with its free institutions, and that the way a free society response to a closed society is not with the response of secretiveness and covertness, but with an open response. In this case, I think, the Association could have been effective had it been able to obtain the funds."

SPIVAK: "Mr. Shaul, did you have something you wanted to say?"

SHAUL: "I just want to say I think the controversy of the last two weeks in itself is a rather damaging case against the proposition put forward. It seems to me that it's very difficult to assume that any governmental support would have been forthcoming, and as one who has had some experience in fund raising for this organization, I think it's equally obvious that there would have been very little likelihood that progressive policies would have been supported by independent foundations. In essence, we would not have had an international program."

NEUMAN: "Senator Jackson, you wanted to say something."

JACKSON: "I think it's very fine to talk about free and voluntary groups. I would like to see this all done in that -- through that route, but I think this ignores the kind of world in which we're living as Secretary of State Dean Rusk has referred to it, there's a lot of back alley fighting going on around the world. They're not following the Marquis of Queensberry rules. This is a bare knuckle operation without kid gloves, and I think that we have to face up to the problem that confronts the country now that this program will not be in existence. The youth of the world are a real prime target for the Soviet Union. In fact, the danger is greater today than ten years ago or fifteen years ago, and I can recite a bill of particulars in that regard, but I'll save that for later."

NEUMAN: "Mr. Frankel."

FRANKEL: "Mr. Shaul, can't you think of lots of things the government ought to be doing that it isn't doing? Would it have been a national disaster if there'd been no international program for your organization."

SHAUL: "Well, I think that's a good question, Mr. Frankel, and perhaps the only way to get at it is I suspect that in ten or fifteen years, if there had been no international program of this type, people might very well be asking why wasn't there, why are we confronting people who have grown up in an environment in which they were never exposed to our kind of ideology and why wasn't the CIA taking care of this."

FRANKEL: "Wasn't one important reason for the secrecy of all this the desire both of our government and in fact of your organization to parade around the world as a very private organization and not to appear as the Russians and the Communists did as subsidized agents of their governments."

SHAUL: "Yes. And I suppose the way to answer that question is to anticipate the question of whether or not in accepting the aid we didn't in fact become like those systems, and I reject that. In part I reject it because, in the first place, the people who went not knowing of the relationship -- and most of them did not -- could not be accused of being agencies -- or agents of the CIA. In the second place I reject it because the history of the Association makes it very clear that unlike the student counterparts in the Soviet

Union or in Eastern Europe, we are an independent group, and the policy statements of the body go to prove it, I think."

FRANKEL: "That wasn't my next question at all. My next question was, were you serving the aims of democracy by living a lie?"

SHAUL: "I don't think it was a lie. I think we lived the truth that we were a body of young people who were dedicated to the principle of internationalism, that we had a body of opinion in this country that represented the opinions of young people, and we were promoting that."

FRANKEL: "But the people in your organization didn't know this. You knew that you -- where the money was coming from and what strings were attached, but people in NSA knew nothing."

SHAUL: "You raised a much more difficult question, don't you really, Mr. Frankel, of how you separate the legislative and executive powers of any organization. Surely one of the problems that's faced in NSA as in any private organization is the fact that however like a town meeting the legislative body may be, the executive in the end must accept the responsibility for fund raising."

FRANKEL: "Now, what about lots of other students in organizations whose views are different from yours. Don't you think they were entitled to some tax support?"

SHAUL: "I don't think that that's a decision that I can make. I think that there are -- there probably was room in our political spectrum for nearly anyone else -- for nearly any representative point of view in this country."

NEUMAN: "Mr. Ross."

ROSS: "Senator Clark, many of the conservative groups in this country are alleging that the bulk of the money for these various organizations which have been disclosed in the last couple of weeks -- that the bulk of the money has gone to left of center groups. They claim, in effect, that this amounts to a government subsidy for partisan political politics within this country in that it freed these various organizations to spend money which they might have to spend on international organizations within this country. How would you as a Senator, and a liberal Senator, respond to that accusation?"

CLARK: "I think, Mr. Ross, what you say is correct, and it just emphasizes the point that Mr. Brown and I have been making, that the end does not justify the means, and it's just as bad to subsidize left of center groups as it is to subsidize right of center groups. And really you get back to a much more important question, going far beyond this whole business of student subsidization, and that is whether in the world of today we still need a department of dirty tricks. I wish we could talk a little bit about that."

NEUMAN: "Excuse me a moment Senator Jackson. I think Senator Clark's been a little short changed to this point."

ROSS: "Now, Senator, Mr. Amory, Allen Dulles, Richard Bissell, the former head of the department of dirty tricks in the CIA, have stated repeatedly that no operation which they have ever undertaken was undertaken on their own, that it always had authorization at the highest level within the Executive Branch of the Government. To liberals of your persuasion, does this not turn the argument toward the President himself? Mustn't your misgivings about the CIA really be direct to the President and to whether or not the United States Government as policy should engage itself in these types of activities?"

CLARK: "No, because I think the answer begs the question. The fact of the matter is that from the very beginning -- let's take the Bay of Pigs as an example. That was CIA-inspired, it was CIA-promoted, it was sold to President Eisenhower by intelligence people who had a conflict of interests. It was then sold to President Kennedy. He didn't know how to get out. And to pretend that this starts with the President and works back to that willing agent of the CIA I think is most disingenuous."

NEUMAN: "Excuse me Senator Clark, I think Mr. Amory has a comment."

AMORY: "Nobody denies that CIA played a major role in the preparatory stage of the Bay of Pigs, but it's a very simple fact that is not too well known that while it provided the drafting room and you might say the carpenters, the architects were supplied by the Joint Chiefs of Staff in the person of a Marine Corps officer."

NEUMAN: "You shook your head when Senator Clark said it originated with the CIA."

AMORY: "It didn't. It originated with the genuine worry of the whole United States Government--what were we going to do when we got a Communist state ninety miles off the -- our coast of Florida."

CLARK: "I think this just emphasizes my argument. We ought to keep these generals on tap, not on top. We ought to keep the CIA on tap, not on top. And the fact that the Bay of Pigs originated with the Joint Chiefs of Staff makes it to my way of thinking all the worse."

JACKSON: "I may be in error about this, but it's my understanding that the authority to go ahead on this was given by the National Security Council, isn't that correct?"

AMORY: "The National Security Council is nothing in law but the President surrounded by his key advisers."

JACKSON: "That's right, but the CIA didn't go ahead on its own without the authority from the National Security Council. Every move that it makes of any major consequence is authorized pursuant to the National Security Act."

NEUMAN: "Mr. Ross."

ROSS: "Senator Clark, as a rather knowledgeable Senator, how much, in fact, do you know about the CIA? Do you know the CIA's budget? Do you know what operations the CIA engages in?"

CLARK: "Well, I bet I know a whole lot less about it than you do, Mr. Ross, and certainly a lot less than Bob Amory, but I will say this. According to the best information I can get from non-classified sources -- most of them due to Mr. Frankel -- the CIA budget is in the neighborhood of \$500 million a year. There's a total intelligence budget of around \$3 billion a year, and I think that kind of money ought to be audited a lot more closely than it is today."

NEUMAN: "Mr. Kiker."

KIKER: "Senator Jackson, do you think that proper Congressional supervision of the CIA does in fact exist?"

JACKSON: "I do. The budget is gone over quite carefully. In fact there's a closer following of the work of that agency than other agencies of the government. Other committees have the opportunity to follow the work of their departments, but they don't always do it."

KIKER: "Well, of course, we have a CIA Watchdog Committee, so-called. Is it unfair to say that there is a tendency among such small groups to become a part of the establishment themselves?"

JACKSON: "No it's not such a small group. But it's made up of course of the ranking members on the Appropriations Committee and the Armed Services Committee in the Senate, likewise in the House. All told there're a substantial number of individuals that are involved in it. It's not so small. There're twelve in the Senate to be exact."

KIKER: "Let me ask you this. Was there any pressure from the White House upon the Congress to not investigate this latest controversy?"

JACKSON: "Never heard of it. No one talked to me. I don't know of anyone who's ever raised the question."

NEUMAN: "Mr. Spivak."

SPIVAK: "Mr. Amory, you've been reported as saying by the Washington Post, and I quote, if we hadn't done this, we could have been run over by the commie front organizations during the Cold War years. Were you accurately quoted on that?"

AMORY: "Yes sir."

SPIVAK: "What did you mean by it?"

AMORY: "Well, I was talking specifically about the student thing. Now, there was this thing called the International Union of Students which was taken over by the Communists as the two gentlemen in front of me well know, was a complete mouthpiece for the then monolithic Communist Party line, and continues to be the Moscow one. It purports to speak for students throughout the world -- the Free World, Europe and elsewhere. It immediately branded the heroic Hungarian Revolution just as fascist beasts showing how -- you can imagine students of their own volition doing that. If we had let them be the only spokesman for students around the world we'd have -- it'd been nonsense. So we find some people

22

think if you continue the quote -- I say we provided the where-withal by which they were enabled to do what they would have done on their own motion had they had the resources."

SPIVAK: "Well, you spent about \$3 million, I believe, on that -- those student activities. Do you really think we got our money's worth out of it? Do you think they contributed enough? Do you think they contributed anything of importance?"

AMORY: "Listen, we spend \$2 million to knock out one bamboo bridge in North Vietnam with a \$2 million Navy fighter that gets shot down. Is that worth our money?"

SPIVAK: "Do you want to say something?"

JACKSON: "Well, I just wanted to observe that American students, I think, played a most effective role in the youth festival in Vienna and in Helsinki, and they were both disasters to the Communist world. They have not held one since. There's one scheduled for 1968, I believe, in Bulgaria, but let's face it, the youth movement was hit hard as far as the Communist youth movement was concerned as a result of American representatives being abroad -- American students."

SPIVAK: "Mr. Amory, I'd like to come to this question of dirty tactics used by the CIA. What about that? Do you use a lot of dirty tactics and can you get along without it?"

AMORY: "Well, if you mean exposing fraud and so on and so forth...."

SPIVAK: "I mean spying, I mean infiltrating students, I mean...."

AMORY: "Well, now if you take the whole job of CIA, it includes espionage. Espionage is not pretty, but it's gone on -- as it's called the second oldest profession in the world, and it goes back a long, long time, and, for example, it's all public knowledge now, we had a penetration of a high Soviet General Staff Corps that led to extraordinary revelations about their defense secrets. That was dirty tricks; there's no question about it. We

suborned a loyal officer of the Soviet Army to talk to us."

SPIVAK: "Well I'm sure you know if you read the press recently that most people today think that's all the CIA does. What else do you do?"

AMORY: "You mean the only thing we do is espionage?"

SPIVAK: "Dirty tricks, yes."

AMORY: "Oh, we do some marvellous things. We put out the foreign broadcast information service, which all you reporters, -- it's the only way you know what's going on in Peking is cause you read what Mao Tse-tung says because we can give you a free service.

SPIVAK: "Senator Clark, you wanted to comment."

CLARK: "It seems to me we ought to separate the department of dirty tricks from the department of intelligence. The department of intelligence is entirely necessary. It does wonderful work. I question whether we now need as big a department of dirty tricks as we did back in the days of Stalin and Joe McCarthy. It seems to me that Arthur Goldberg and Adlai Stevenson give us a seems to me that Arthur Goldberg and Adlai Stevenson give us a little better models in that regard."

NEUMAN: "Senator Jackson, you wanted to say something."

JACKSON: "I couldn't disagree more. I think the challenge that we face as far as the youth of the world is concerned and as far as the labor movements are concerned are greater today than before. The threat in South America -- college after college has been infiltrated -- have been infiltrated by the Communists. They have -- they're the largest single force in the student groups in Italy. They're making great inroads in Spain and in France. In fact one of the problems within NATO is the progress that the communists have been able to make with student groups against NATO. I think the problems that we face in the political area is tremendous. I think the question before us -- are we going to permit unilateral political disarmament? This is what we face and I think we're in this discussion nothing has been said -- what do we do about this program that has been lost."

NEUMAN: "Mr. Spivak, a question to Mr. Amory."

SPIVAK: "Mr. Amory, there's a general and a growing feeling that the CIA's reputation in the world is so bad that it's become a burden on American foreign policy rather than a useful secret weapon. Will you comment on that?"

AMORY: "Well, I think it's an interesting phenomenon of our times that the biggest selling novels are all spy novels. We've all got a sort of a spy psychose in Western Europe and I guess the rest of the world and certainly in America, and I think it's unfortunate that things have to be wrapped together, as the two Senators say, the problem of political action should be wrapped with that of espionage. And maybe Secretary Katzenbach's and Secretary Gardner's committee will come up with a recommendation that they be separated. There are many different ways of running a railroad, but I agree with Senator Jackson. You can't get out of the political action business so long as we got this kind of a divided world, even though Mao Tse-tung and Brezhnev are at each others throat."

NEUMAN: "Mr. Frankel."

FRANKEL: "Mr. Brown, I know it's dangerous to speak to any group of students larger than two, but could you tell us what your organization and the students in it really are up to in the world? Why do you want to have an international program? Do you feel it's your job to go out and fight communist subversion in other groups."

BROWN: "Well, I'd like to comment first that it's been most enjoyable to hear people here this afternoon discussing the importance of what only 25 of us in the country, it seems, recognized prior to this afternoon, and the importance of youth in student activities abroad. I think most of us today are not interested in international student relations as a way of fighting the commies. We have a much more, I think, a much more creative viewpoint of what can be done in the world. The possibilities of encouraging, particularly the democratic left abroad. The Spanish situation is an obvious example where in fact the only alternative offered to the Spanish student has been one of the Communists, and the International Union of Students issued a very strong statement saying anyone who opposes their front in Spain is not contributing to student welfare and student solidarity in Spain. I think we can

25

offer a creative alternative. I'm not talking about going out and just fighting. I'm saying that the problem of creating a democratic student movement is a real one, and that it's an important one because of where those people will be politically ten, twenty years from now."

FRANKEL: "Are you saying that you would want to go out and make contacts with Spanish students who are opposed to their government and encourage them? Is that what you're saying?"

BROWN: "Well, in fact, we have made those sorts of things. It's the policy of our Association in the past has been to oppose US political, economic, and military aid to Spain. We've been very concerned about the development of a free student movement in Spain and elsewhere in countries which are basically ruled by dictators. And I personally, and I think most of the people with whom I'm associated would like to continue the opportunity to develop democratic reform in Spain and elsewhere."

NEUMAN: "Mr. Ross."

ROSS: "Mr. Shaul, you've had a good deal of experience in the academic community. What is your feeling in regard to professors at various institutes around the country accepting CIA funds and doing -- without declaring that they have accepted the CIA funds?"

SHAUL: "Well, it's a difficult issue. It will depend I think on circumstances in each case how one is going to resolve that question. I think that the astonishingly bad thing about this whole thing is that there is often -- there are often so few alternatives to these people. We have to develop, I think, private institutions or some other mechanism which will negate the need to have only the CIA in this business."

NEUMAN: "Gentlemen, we have about three minutes left. Mr. Kiker."

KIKER: "Senator Clark, I think it's clear that you agree that some form of new supervision over the CIA should be imposed by the legislative branch. Exactly how would you go about it? What changes would you make?"

CLARK: "I'm not sure that I do, Mr. Kiker. It may well be that the existing controls, which I think have fallen into some disuse, would be adequate. Let's remember we have a lot of agencies theoretically operating. Maybe the trouble is not with the institutions, it's with the men. For example, I know Senator Jackson and I disagree. I think the wrong senators are doing the watchdog job."

KIKER: "Do you think it's time then for a full Congressional investigation to see if in fact there is enough supervision?"

CLARK: "Yes, I support the Eugene McCarthy resolution which was introduced in the Senate two or three days ago. I think we need a special select committee to look into this thing very carefully and to come back with some recommendations."

NEUMAN: "Mr. Spivak."

SPIVAK: "Senator Jackson, I believe you're on the committee which watchdogs the CIA. There have been charges that you really don't watch over it, but that you protect it. Are there any truths to those charges?"

JACKSON: "We try to protect the secrets. I've only been on a short time, but I've had the privileges of following the fine work of these dedicated men in CIA since 1949. It's a first rate organization, but the committee has been critical. The recommendations I think, are followed quite closely from the two committees of the Senate."

SPIVAK: "How well informed is the committee, though? How much does the CIA tell it?"

JACKSON: "I think the committee gets all that it needs to know. It can't get every detail. This is a vast organization and it's a tremendous undertaking, Mr. Spivak."

SPIVAK: "May I run down this very quickly with all of you? What lesson do you think is to be learned from all of this. Senator Clark, briefly, would you tell us?"

CLARK: "Honesty is the best policy in a democratic society."

27

SPIVAK: "Senator Jackson."

JACKSON: "I think it brings home the point that we'll have revelations about the CIA from time to time as long as the Cold War is on, as long as the United States remains a world power. I don't think you can avoid it."

SPIVAK: "Mr. Amory."

AMORY: "Well, I think it's a commentary on the immaturity of our society. We have a free motherland in England that has had a secret service going back to the time of Queen Elizabeth, and they just don't talk about it. If something comes out like this that's a mistake, everybody hushes up in the interest of their national security and what they think is the interest of Free World civilization."

SPIVAK: "Mr. Brown, what do you think the lesson is?"

BROWN: "It seems to me the important lesson to be learned from this is that in a democratic society the way that you make an attempt to oppose closed societies is in open and democratic ways because if you attempt them in covert ways, it's going to come out in the open, it's going to destroy whatever good work may have been done, and that the only way to fight those societies is in a free and open way."

SPIVAK: "Now Mr. Shaul."

SHAUL: "We can be proud of our history and private organizations need more help than they're getting now."

NEUMAN: "Well, I think at that point with that summary, our time is up. I have to interrupt that."

"Thank you gentlemen. Senators Jackson and Clark, Mr. Amory, Mr. Brown, Mr. Shaul for being with us today on this special edition of 'Meet the Press.'"